

**Remarks**

Claims 1-6, 8-10 and 12-25 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 15, 19, 20, 21, 24 and 25 are amended.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Bui during the June 6 interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated into the present response.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Office Action indicates the claims 22 and 23 are allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cetrelli in view of Weber and Kosterka. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cetrelli in view of Weber and Kosterka and further in view of Kuchenbecker. Claims 4 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cetrelli in view of Weber and Kosterka and further in view of Voss. Claims 12, 13, 15-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cetrelli in view of Weber and Matsuoka. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Cetrelli in view of Weber and Matsuoka and further in view of Kuchenbecker. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cetrelli in view of Weber and Kosterka and further in view of the Official Notice. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Cetrelli does not disclose a blank having parallel cut-out grooves and comprising a foldline extending along a horizontal midline thereof transverse to the parallel groove.

Rather, Cetrelli teaches the use of creases located parallel to a folding line 5, where the creases are formed by impression into the blank. See column 6, lines 20-37 of Cetrelli.

In fact, Cetrelli teaches away from the use of any other types of grooves besides impressed grooves, since Cetrelli requires impressed grooves to ensure that delamination occurs between the grooves, which prevents crease formation along the fold line disposed between the grooves. In other words, the creases of Cetrelli are not cut-out grooves in that they are not formed by removing material from the original blank.

Further, there is no motivation to combine Cetrelli with both Weber and Kosterka. As admitted by the Examiner, Cetrelli teaches the use of a paper laminate rather than paperboard. Specifically, Cetrelli teaches the use of a laminate with a paper core, coated on both sides with a thermoplastic material and further including an aluminum layer and states that the use of such a laminate leads to problems in folds due to the differing properties of the materials in the laminate. As the invention of Cetrelli is disclosed as being specifically related to problems inherent to laminates with components having different material properties there would be no motivation to one of skill in the art to look at other materials, such as paperboard, which do not have this problem. Further, Cetrelli is nonanalogous prior art as it relates to creasing in a multilayer laminate as opposed to the formation of grooves in paperboard. Accordingly, there is no motivation to combine Cetrelli with Weber and Kosterka.

Further, regarding the rejections of claims 3 and 14, as mentioned above, Cetrelli teaches away from using cut-out grooves, so that there would have been no motivation

Appl. No. 10/764,761  
Amdt. dated July 30, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2007

to combine Cetrelli with Kuchenbecker, which teaches the general concept of forming grooves using a laser, to arrive at the claimed invention.

Still further, there is no motivation to combine Weber with another reference teaching a fold along a horizontal midline as such a fold would be deleterious to the integrity and rigidity of the box and thus counter to the teaching of Weber.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Any fee required to maintain the pendency of this application and not submitted herewith should be charged to the Deposit Account of the undersigned attorneys, Account No. 01-1785; any refund should be credited to the same account. A copy of this document is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted

AMSTER, ROTHSTEIN & EBENSTEIN LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant  
90 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
(212) 336-8000

Dated: New York, New York  
July 30, 2007

By:   
Benjamin M. Halpern  
Registration No.: 46,494